

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 14, 18, 22, 28, 33, 37, 42 and 46 have been amended. The Application contains claims 1-60. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Claims 1-13, 37-41 and 46-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pinard (U.S. Patent no. 5,454,032) or Bannister (U.S. Patent no. 5,548,636). Claims 1-13, 37-41 and 46-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mukerjee (U.S. Patent no. 6,405,041). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a system for establishing telephone communication between a telephone call placed to a primary telephone number and at least one of a plurality of telephone devices, where the primary telephone number is associated with a primary telephone device. The system comprises a database for storing one or more other telephone numbers associated with the primary telephone number, means for detecting placement of the telephone call to the primary telephone number, means for retrieving at least one of the other telephone numbers from said database, means for placing a call to the at least one of the other telephone numbers and means for connecting the telephone call to the at least one of the plurality of telephone devices, if the first one of the plurality of telephone devices goes off hook before the primary telephone device goes off hook. According to claim 1, "said detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection."

Applicant respectfully submits that Pinard, Bannister and Mukerjee fail to disclose or suggest the claim 1 invention. Specifically, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical

extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection.” Specifically, the cited references’ processing of inbound calls are each dependant on core switch intelligence. Hence, when an inbound call is presented to a PBX or central office (CO) switch in the systems of the cited references, the central office switch or PBX must initiate a logical process to determine the routing of the call. Once the routing determination is made, the central office switch or PBX must manage the call accordingly. Therefore, in the cited references a call is processed by the CO switch or PBX, then routed to the remote devices.

In the claimed invention, on the other hand, call handling is entirely managed external from PBX or CO via a physical connection of the detecting means. The claimed invention requires no programming or logic changes to the PBX or CO switch. Hence, in the claimed invention, the host switch is not performing any intelligent functionality in the processing of remote devices being engaged to the call. This is possible because the claimed invention is connected to the PBX by a physical analog line connection to each extension. The claimed invention detects the inbound call activity of the PBX by detecting e.g., a voltage change on the analog extension. This voltage change on the analog extension, triggers the claimed invention to ring the remote devices. Therefore, the claimed invention is not in the call path unless the user answers a remote device and is authenticated by the claimed invention. In all of the cited references, the device ringing the plurality of remote devices is in the call path and must treat unanswered calls as it has official call control. This logical and physical difference in architecture is neither intuitive nor possible to incorporate in the systems of the cited references.

As such, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1.

Claim 9 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number” and an “engine retrieving the secondary telephone number from said database upon detecting the first telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection, said engine placing a second call to the secondary telephone number and bridging the first telephone call to the secondary telephone device.” As such, claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and are allowable along with claim 9.

Claim 37 recites “detecting placement of a telephone call to the primary telephone number by detecting activity on a physical connection to a telephone port associated with the primary telephone number.” As such, claim 37 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 38-41 depend from claim 37 and are allowable along with claim 37.

Claim 46 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical port associated with a first communication device” and “a memory, wherein a computer program is stored in said memory for execution by said processing unit to detect an attempt to initiate communications with [[a]] the first communication device via said connection means.” As such, claim 46 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 47-60 depend from claim 46 and are allowable along with claim 46.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 14-36 and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mauger (U.S. Patent no. 5,537,610) or Widergen (U.S. Patent no. 5,890,064). Claims 14-36 and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Eriksson (U.S. Patent no. 5,956,652) or Sjodin (U.S. Patent no. 5,995,843). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 recites an apparatus including “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the landline telephone” and “a telephony engine coupled to said database and said connection means.” According to claim 14, “said engine receiving a telephone call, determining if the telephone call was received from the wireless telephone, retrieving telephone line connection information from said database corresponding to the landline telephone, and connecting the telephone call to a telephone line coupled to the landline telephone via said connection means on the basis of said telephone line connection information, the telephone call being connected to the telephone line such that the wireless telephone receives a dial tone.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose the limitations of claim 14. Specifically, none of the cited references disclose tapping into a physical connection to a physical extension associated with a landline telephone. In addition, the cited references fail to disclose connecting the telephone call to a telephone line coupled to the landline telephone via said connection means on the basis of telephone line connection information retrieved from a database. As such, claim 14 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and are allowable along with claim 14.

Claim 18 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to the telephone extension” and “a telephony engine coupled to said database and the enterprise network, said engine being adapted to determine if a telephone call was received from the wireless device and connects the device to the telephone extension via the connection means so that the wireless device receives a dial tone from the

enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension.” As such, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 18 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are allowable along with claim 18.

Claim 22 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to the first telephone extension” and a “processor adapted to connect a first telephone call placed to the first telephone to the second telephone via the connection means based on the connection information.” As such, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 22 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 23-27 depend from claim 22 and are allowable along with claim 22.

Claim 28 recites “detecting placement of the telephone call to the primary telephone number by detecting activity on a physical connection to a telephone port associated with the primary telephone number.” As such, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 28 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 29-32 depend from claim 28 and are allowable along with claim 28.

Claim 33 recites “connecting the wireless device to the telephone extension via a physical connection to the telephone extension so that the wireless device receives a dial tone from the enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension.” As such, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 33 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 34-36 depend from claim 33 and are allowable along with claim 33.

Claim 42 recites “connecting the wireless device to the telephone extension via a physical analog connection to the extension so that the wireless device receives a

dial tone from the enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension." As such, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 42 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 43-45 depend from claim 42 and are allowable along with claim 42.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant